g, 11½ inches by 8 inches. Posts (double), each 1 foot by 8 inches, h. Hanging ties, double, i, 8¾ inches by 4½ inches. Longitudinal ties, k, 6 inches by 4½ inches. Ridge, l, 9½ inches by 7 inches. Cross pieces under ditto, 6¾ inches by 4½ inches. Purlins, 9½ inches by 7 inches. Common rafters, 4½ inches by 4 inches. The whole covered with battens and tiles. G. R. B.

SCHINKEL ON ART-EDUCATION.

The Germans are perhaps more accustomed to generalize their views of the fine arts than is the case with us; and as a result of this course, I think we may take the fact of there existing in Germany two distinct schools * of architecture, the *classical* and the *mediæval*, which may be said to have their respective head quarters at Berlin and Munich; and that the followers of these two directions base their practice on some fixed principles, may be gathered from the active and able manner in which they respectively defend their own, in the different polemical essays which have issued from the pens of the foremost champions of each party.†

The *classical* school must certainly be considered to have been founded by C. F. Schinkel, whose principal works are known to most of us; and though they are certainly open to criticism, it is in fact because they are something more than mere lifeless imitations and adaptations of the antique forms, such as constitute the chief part of our modern classical architecture. Schinkel was educated as an artist and scene-painter, and, as might be expected from this circumstance, the picturesque element is seldom wanting in his designs, but that he also worked upon principles arrived at by a careful study of his art is shown, I think, by the following translation of notes found among his papers, and published by Dr. G. F. Waagen, on one of the anniversaries of his birthday which is kept at Berlin. They form evidently only a fragment, but seem to afford subject for much reflection to the architect who aims at that amount of individual originality which alone can effect the general advancement of his art:—

"I discovered," he says, "as soon as I had commenced my architectural studies, that a vast treasure of forms had been originated and worked out by nations essentially different, in the course of many centuries of development. But I also saw that the use we made of this store of sometimes heterogeneous matter was very *indiscriminate*; and what, in its original use in old buildings, produced a very pleasing effect, when introduced into modern works seemed entirely inappropriate. It struck me particularly that we may find the cause of the great want of character and style, from which so many of our modern buildings suffer, in this want of discrimination. I forthwith made it the aim of my life to obtain a clearer view of this subject; but the further I proceeded the greater seemed to be the difficulties which opposed my progress. I soon fell into the error of designing a building *solely* with reference to its intended use and construction, from which resulted a work dry and lifeless, devoid of two essential elements, the historical and the poetical. I examined further how far the practical consideration of the subject ought to prevail, to render the appearance of a building accordant with its purpose, and how far, on the other hand, the influence of ancient monuments ought to co-operate with artistic feeling to give the building the character of a work of art. From these considerations it appeared to me that I had discovered that position in the art of architecture which must be occupied by the purely artistical element, and beyond which it is and must always remain a scientific handicraft; further, that in this position, as throughout the theory of the fine arts, the assertion of any distinct doctrine must be difficult, and will be reduced at last to the cultivation of taste, which in architecture embraces a very wide field, and must be formed in the most diversified manner to produce any successful result.

I think it necessary to state precisely the different spheres in which the taste of the architect must necessarily be developed, in order that I may at the same time give a general view of the art.

In the first place he must consider what the age demands as *essential* in its architectural undertakings.

Secondly, he must take a review of the past in order to see what has been already worked out for similar purposes, and how far any *completely developed work* may be appropriate and useful to us.

Thirdly, he must determine what *modifications* are necessary in that which appears suitable to our purposes.

And, lastly, in what manner the *imagination* must be employed to create *new matter* for these modifications, and how it is to be treated as to its forms, so as to harmonize with the traditional ancient part, and without losing sight of the original style of the design, to produce the impression of an entirely new one, in which, at the same time, the assimilation to the old style may still be recognised, and afford an additional charm."

In speaking of the utilitarianism of the present public taste, he says:—"In judging of works of art, and more particularly of architecture, few people can raise their minds sufficiently to take general views: usually that only is beautiful and praiseworthy which they desire according to their station of life, and think suitable to the same. A certain completeness and finish in the ordinary articles of domestic use constitutes their ideal of beauty. Any thing new or grand is rarely appreciated by the great mass of the people, and, if it does agree with their ideas of comfort, will always meet with great censure and opposition. Artists that are only influenced by this utilitarian opinion must soon sink from the regions of art to be the slaves of fashion. C. F.

* We can scarcely claim such a degree of organization for this country.

† I may perhaps follow out this subject further on a future occasion, if an opportunity occur.

ON THE BASILICAS OF CHRISTIAN ROME.*

There is no feeling so intimately connected with architecture as religion, for amidst all forms of faith, however mistaken, there ever has been shown a desire to render the place of worship worthy of the divinity worshipped. Before the reign of Constantine, as is well known, the Christians—the followers of a prohibited creed—assembled in the rooms of private houses and in obscure retreats, or, if occasionally permitted to construct buildings for the performance of their rites, they were not allowed either to make them of large dimensions or to consult their external appearance. It will be recollected, too, that there existed at Rome places of Christian worship, of a remarkable character, which had a direct influence upon the structure of the churches which were subsequently built. I allude to the catacombs.

Constantine, who first extended to Christianity the protection of the law, built his first church at Rome. Rome, therefore, may be said to have been the birthplace of ecclesiastical architecture.

Whilst conscientious feelings deterred and repelled the early Christians from adopting the heathen temples for the purposes of Christian worship, the same feelings attracted them to holy ground. From the custom which had originated in the catacombs,—from the habit which the primitive Christians had acquired of visiting the graves of the martyrs,—it became a matter of necessity to associate the church with the tomb.

The first and earliest Christian churches of which we can form any clear idea, either from actual plans, or existing remains, are the sepulchral churches of the Constantine age. The most remarkable monument of the Christian world—the Church of the Holy Sepulchre raised by Constantine—from its sanctity and celebrity, became the primitive type of all the other churches of a circular form. This circular form, however, was in no wise calculated to receive a Christian congregation during the celebration of the entire liturgy, nor was it appropriate for the service of the altar.

The heathen temple, then, being found unfit, and the form of the sepulchral church being inconvenient or inappropriate, for the purposes of liturgical worship, the adoption of some other type became necessary. Could the professors of Christianity find any edifices raised by the heathen, but unpolluted by idol-worship, which might be adapted to their form of worship? Such did exist.

Amongst the structures with which ancient Rome was adorned, was the basilica. This, being unpolluted by heathen rites, was found to be well adapted for Christian worship. The name of the basilica was adopted from the Greeks of Athens, whose second archon was styled ἄρχων βασιλεύς, and the tribunal where he adjudicated στοὰ βασίλειος, situate in the Athenian Ceramicus, immediately beneath the Pnyx. According to Livy, the basilica did not appear at Rome until the year 182 B.C. It was situate in the forum. The destination of the secular basilica was two-fold: it was at once a court of justice and an exchange. The building was an oblong, terminated by the tribunal. In the centre of the semi-circular apsis was placed the curule chair of the prætor, and seats for judices. This is the portion to which in Scripture (St. John, xix. 13) the name of gabbatha, or lithostroton (pavement) was assigned. Round the sides of the hemicycle, called the wings (cornua), were seats for persons of distinction, as well as the parties engaged in the proceedings. These seats were guarded from intrusion by the *cancelli*. Three-fourths of the oblong composed a hall, the remainder was a transverse aisle which intervened between the hall and the semi-circular recess. In all the basilicas the great hall was divided by columns into a portion similar to the centre aisle of a church, and two side aisles, separated from the centre one each by a single row of columns. Behind each of these columns was placed a square pier or pilaster, which supported the flooring of an upper portico, similar to the gallery of a modern church. The upper gallery was in like manner decorated with columns of lower dimensions than those below, and these served to support the roof, and were connected with one another by a parapet wall or balustrade: this gallery reached entirely round the inside of the building; one side of it was occupied by women, and the other by men. The staircase which led to the upper portico was on the outside. Sometimes the whole building was covered by a roof, sometimes only portions. At the sides, the more ancient of these edifices were entirely open to the external air, being surrounded and protected solely by an open peristyle of columns. At a later date a wall was substituted for the external peristyle.

From the description which has been given, it will be evident how much these edifices were adapted to the uses of a Christian church. The general shape of the church, as prescribed by the apostolical constitutions, was to be an oblong, like unto a ship, that is, to the vessel of the ark. The term *nave* shows how enduringly the idea prevailed in subsequent ages. The basilicæ, therefore, were accordingly given up, for the purpose of Christian worship. Ausonius, addressing the Emperor Gratianus, tells him:—"*Basilica olim negotiis plena, nunc votis pro tuâ salute susceptis.*" This occupation of the Roman basilicæ was, nevertheless, only temporary; they did not become the abiding places of faith. Only *one* existing example can be found of a secular basilica actually converted into a Christian church; and that example, memorable as it is, does not exist in Rome. It is to be found in Treves. Abandoned for more hallowed ground—the graves of the martyrs—the civil basilicas were destroyed, and the columns which supported them transported to the new sites.

A Christian basilica may be thus briefly described. It consisted of four principal parts:—1. Πρόναος, the vestibule of entrance. 2. Ναῦς, *navis*, and sometimes *gremium*, the nave or centre aisle, which was divided from the two side aisles by a row of columns on each of its sides. Here the people assembled for the purposes of worship. 3. Ἄνβων (ἀναβαίνειν, to ascend), *chorus* (the choir), and *suggestus*, a part of the lower extremity of the nave, raised above the general level of the floor by a flight of steps. 4. Ἱερατεῖον, ἱερὸν βῆμα, *sanctuarium*, which answered to the tribune of the ancient basilica. In the centre of this sanctuary was placed the high altar, under a tabernacle or canopy, such as still remains in the

* The following paper was read by Mr. Talbot Harnard, at a meeting of the Bedfordshire Archæological and Architectural Society. Reported in the *Bedford Times*.

To learn more about PDF Compression and OCR go to ThePaperlessOffice.org